

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action dated June 28, 2005. A diligent effort has been made to respond to each of the rejections contained in the Office Action. It is believed that this Amendment/Response overcomes those rejections and thus places this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over US 2004/0015569 to Lonnfors. The filing date of Lonnfors is July 16, 2002. Claims 20 and 34 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over US 2004/0198379 to Magee. The filing date of Magee is August 28, 2002. The remaining claims were rejected under 35 USC 103 over Lonnfors in view of Magee, or over Lonnfors in view of several other references. All of the 103 rejections are made primarily in view of Lonnfors.

As shown in the accompanying Rule 131 Declaration of Prior Invention, however, the presently claimed invention was conceived of prior to July 16, 2002, which is the filing date of Lonnfors, and the inventors and their patent counsel then diligently worked on constructively reducing the invention to practice from prior to this date until the filing of the provisional application 60/411,744 on September 19, 2002. Thus, all of the rejections over Lonnfors and Magee must be withdrawn.

With the rejections withdrawn, it is submitted that this case is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David B. Cochran
Reg. No. 39,142
Jones Day
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
216-586-7029